DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 447 EC 111 277

AUTHOR Gilmore, Joseph T.; Argyros, Nicholas S.
TITLE Special Education Certification: A State of the Art Survey.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office for the Education of Children with Handicapped Conditions.; New York State Univ. System, Albany.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE Dec 77
GRANT G007602963
NOTE 58p.; Some pages may be marginally legible due to small type

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conceptual Schemes; Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Models; Professional Personnel; Special Education; State of the Art Reviews; State Surveys; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications

ABSTRACT

Designed as a working document on professional preparation of special education instructional and support personnel, the report analyzes the state of the art in special education certification. It is explained that data on certification requirements was collected from each state, and that results indicated the existence of four models: categorical and competency based (six or more categories of handicapping conditions), generic certificates (fewer than six handicapping conditions), the California model and the Massachusetts model. Additional findings are listed, including the existence of a wide variety of terms and degrees of specificity. Issues and discussion starters are described to provide a stimulus for workshop discussion in the areas of categories of certification, supervision/administration, participation of other agencies, inservice training, and personnel development plans. Tables of state certification information are appended. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED158447

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SPECIAL EDUCATION CERTIFICATION: A STATE OF THE ART SURVEY

Toward a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development

Joseph T. Gilmore
Nicholas S. Argyros

Board of Regents Research Fund
The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Office for the Education of
Children with Handicapping Conditions

in cooperation with

The Research Foundation
of the
City University of New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joseph T. Gilmore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EC 111 277

The activities which are the subject of this report have been made possible by funding awarded to the Research Fund of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, the State Education Department, Office for the Education of Children with Handicapping Conditions, by the United States Office of Education for the Handicapped, Division of Personnel Preparation, Grant Number G007602968, Project Number 451AH60852.

The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... page v

PREFACE vi

INTRODUCTION viii

PURPOSES 1

BACKGROUND 1

METHOD 7

FINDINGS 7

ISSUES, QUESTIONS, AND DISCUSSION STARTERS 11

REFERENCES 22

APPENDIX A: *Federal Register*, Vol. 42, No. 163
P.L. 94-142, Paragraphs 121a380 to 121a387

APPENDIX B: Table of state certifications by category of handicapping conditions

APPENDIX C: Table of state certifications by level (class) of certificate

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge, first, that we assume full responsibility for the substance and style of this document.

We wish, however, to express particular thanks to a number of persons whose support helped to make our work in the preparation of this report possible.

General support for the Competence Based Teacher Education project in special education, of which this report is a spinoff, has come from the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Division of Personnel Preparation. Jasper Harvey, Director; Herman Saettler, Eastern Region Branch Chief, and Thomas Behrens, Project Officer, Division of Personnel Preparation, BEH, have each in their own way been supportive of the work of the CBTE project, have provided their typical understanding and guidance in the problems and promise of personnel education in New York State, and have allowed us the opportunity to share some of our materials with a wider audience.

Jean R. Hebeler, of the University of Maryland, and Co-Director, Professional Standards and Guideline Project of the Council of Exceptional Children, provided valuable counsel as we undertook this report.

Edward L. Dambruch and Mary Costello Pasciucco of the Rhode Island Department of Education were instrumental in fostering the preparation of the original document and workshop which furnished the foundation and impetus for this present effort.

Patricia M. Kay, of Baruch College and the Center for Advanced Study in Education of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, facilitated the subcontract which allowed for the development and printing of this document.

Elizabeth Walldov, Supervisor, Grants Coordination for the Research Foundation of the City University of New York, was extremely helpful in the fulfillment of requirements for the subcontract.

Helen Hartle, Director of the Interstate Certification Project, provided information on interstate agreements.

Vincent Gazzetta and Charles Mackey, Jr. of the New York State Education Department contributed input to portions of this document.

PREFACE

This document is a contribution to dialogue on questions related to certification in special education anticipated to arise from the implementation of P.L. 94-142. Certainly not a final word on any of the evolving issues, the data and discussions may be of interest and value particularly to individuals and groups contributing to each state's development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development. The document, or components of it, may serve as a discussion guide and stimulant in itself, or as the framework for a group to tailor its own decision-making approaches.

All states have been included in this study, and copies will be shared with interested parties across all the states. The authors emphasize, however, that the purpose is by no means to be considered as a suggestion that there should be nationwide certification requirements. Each state has its own unique problems and patterns; this has resulted, as the study points out, in a great diversity of terminology and approach. Even if nationwide certification requirements were deemed desirable, the current state of the art would rule out such an eventuality as nearly impossible. Professional mobility to cross state lines, however, is clearly a value to individual teachers in our mobile society; in the case of teachers trained for children in low incidence areas of handicapping conditions, the issue becomes even more compelling. There seems also to be a need emerging for regional preparatory programs. Interstate agreement will be discussed later in these pages as one helpful approach to these concerns.

This document is a spinoff product of the Competence Based Teacher Education Project in Special Education, a project funded by the Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Division of Personnel Preparation, to the Research Fund of the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York. While the CBTE Project focused primarily on teacher education programming, there has been a clear connection between alternative training strategies and models for the certification of teachers.

The Director of the CBTE Project, Joseph T. Gilmore, was invited by Edward L. Dambruch, of the Rhode Island State Department of Education to prepare a report and conduct a workshop for the Rhode Island Special Education Staff Development Committee. Nicholas S. Argyros, consultant for the New York State Education Department in the area of programs evaluation, collaborated in the preparation of the report and the conducting of that workshop in September, 1977. Subsequently, Mary Costello Pasciucco, of the Rhode Island Department of Education, informed the authors that the Interstate Manpower Planning Committee consisting of a number of northeastern region states had evidenced great interest in the report. A decision was made to significantly revise and expand the original

report, particularly in the data area, and to distribute the report to a wider audience who might also find our compilation of use.

The main thrust of the report as a working document has been retained. For the original audience, the authors presented a number of specific, definite recommendations. In this expanded version, we have taken a more neutral stance. Rather than recommendations, we have presented issues, questions and discussion starters. At the Rhode Island workshop, the consultants used a process format designed to provide each participant a full opportunity in small groups to discuss the "pros" and "cons" of each issue, and to write these down on cards for other small groups to react to. Subsequently the whole group met and had a visual picture of issues upon which there was general consensus, pro and con, and an agenda for meeting the issues needing additional deliberation before decisions might be reached.

In the original report, the recommendations rather clearly revealed the authors' convictions and biases. These may show up in this present report, despite our attempts to be more circumspect. One thing remains certain: the authors have made extensive use of the guidelines developed by the broadly based Professional Standards and Guidelines Project under the auspices of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Belloc's poem about authors whose sins were scarlet but whose books were read is apropos. Setting aside all questions of color, the authors will be delighted if this report is read and proves to be a helpful guide to any individual reader. They suggest that any group using this document or parts of it, may find that "neutral" consultants, particularly those with process skills, will help move the discussion and decision-making processes in positive and productive directions.

Joseph T. Gilmore

Nicholas S. Argyros

Albany, New York
December 30, 1977

INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared for use as a working document. It is offered as one possible step in a series of steps towards the goal of ensuring appropriate professional preparation for special education instructional and support personnel. The quality of such personnel is crucial in determining the adequacy and effectiveness of programs and services to children with special needs.

A working document is unsuccessful if it gathers dust on some shelf in a hidden corner of a library. This report will fail the children it ultimately hopes to serve if it is not put to work. Please read it; fold, mutilate and spindle it; write questions and observations in its margins. To guarantee a professional integrity to this process, please strive to keep an open mind, perhaps even a "zero-based" approach to special education certification requirements.

Keeping such an open mind is not an easy thing to do. The pattern of human response to change is often to grasp more tightly to the tried and true. "Future shock" is certainly upon us. A new era of kaleidoscopic change has been ushered in by the convergence of a number of profound and complex forces impinging on education in general and on special education in particular.

Pressures are on all educators and often there aren't enough hours in our days to analyze the complex forces and issues precipitating the need for change, to weigh the implications of change, and to summon the wisdom necessary to direct change in a growth-inducing way. A frustrated researcher once said of the process of change in teacher education: "It's like trying to change the tire on your car—while it's still running."

To keep our minds open in the task confronting us amid the pressures upon us, we might also be mindful of the mother of a handicapped child who said, "Educators are so afraid of change in their programs; for years you've asked us to wait—but my child can't wait anymore" Many such children can't wait any longer. So the difficult work we are embarked upon is tremendously meaningful and significant, and worthy of our best professional efforts in weighing the pros and cons of each of the issues before us.

This brings us to suggest a way in which this report can become truly a working document—through scheduling a workshop to address the advisability, necessity and/or direction of change in special education certification requirements. The services of a process person to facilitate the group's discussion of questions and issues raised in this report may be used. Through discussions, it is hoped that the participants will examine the forces for and against and, where possible within the time available, reach a working consensus to retain, adapt, discard, modify, certification requirements currently in force. The main thrust of this report and of the workshop(s) should be to provide a stimulating process through which the

group may share information and viewpoints necessary for acting upon specific recommendations, recommendations which must be tailored to political, fiscal, psychological and time realities that are possibly unique to each individual state. In this context, the work of the group is seen as far more vital for the education of each state's children with special needs than is the work of the authors. Your work will continue in defining the problems further, in designing and developing certification requirements, in disseminating the product to a broad-based variety of concerned individuals and organizations, in incorporating feedback, in making recommendations to the state's appropriate governing body and in guiding the adoption of new requirements for special education certification. The authors sincerely hope that they have provided some of the answers significant to the success of your work. More importantly, we hope that we will at least have raised most of the right questions. This is important in terms of an assumption undergirding this report: our belief that change will continue to be pervasive throughout special education. The process we are involved in points to the necessity of periodic evaluation, review, and updating of programs and services in this era of change. However painful it may be to be constantly "beginning again," it is now more than ever a necessary component of an ongoing professional commitment to children with special needs. We are grateful for the opportunity to share in this process of realizing your commitment.

SPECIAL EDUCATION CERTIFICATION:

A STATE OF THE ART SURVEY

PURPOSES

The purposes of this document are:

1. To report on the state of the art in special education certification (teaching, supervision and administration) in the States of the Union.
2. To present an analysis of certification documents furnished by the states.
3. To summarize an ERIC review of literature relevant to the issue of special education certification.
4. To present a summary of findings.
5. To delineate some major special education certification models.
6. To raise specific discussion questions for each state to consider based on data acquired, new state regulations and federal mandates.

The context of this report is the larger one of the decision-making process of whether, to what extent, and/or how, currently existing state certification requirements may need to be modified through additions or deletions. In this context, this report has further purposes:

7. To serve as an issue discussion tool to be used by a broadly based group concerned about special education certification, particularly under the aegis of the state component working on the development and implementation of the state plan for a comprehensive system of personnel development.
8. To serve as the framework for a document to be shared with teachers, administrators, and all other necessary parties to ensure that certification requirements to be enacted will be compatible with Federal and State regulations and have a broadly based understanding and consensus to ensure a free, appropriate public education for every handicapped child by qualified personnel.

BACKGROUND

Abeson and Fleury (1972) published a study of state certification requirements for education of the handicapped, noting that no single document existed that persons interested or involved in teaching or administering educational programs for exceptional children could turn to for specific state requirements. With the cooperation of the State Directors of Special Education, they provided an alphabetical state-by-state listing of state requirements for certification in the education of handicapped children which includes information on types of certificates required, general requirements, and requirements specific to various disability areas. General requirements include such matters as official transcripts, health certificate, professional references, birth certificate, and certificate from an in-state institution. Types of certification are said to be a specific special education certificate or an endorsement attached to a regular elementary or secondary certificate. Listed are course requirements, competency requirements,

and extra training, experience or education necessary for specializing in specific disability areas.

Specific disability areas included:

Deaf
Hard of hearing
Mentally retarded
Speech and hearing therapy
Multiply handicapped
Physically handicapped
Learning disabilities
Emotionally disturbed
Visually impaired
Administration

In a personal communication with the authors, Abeson indicated that an updating of the 1972 publication was certainly a necessity but had not been effected, nor was he aware of any present plans to do so.

The National Association for Retarded Citizens (1973) presented position statements and recommendations by the Education Committee of the National Association for Retarded Citizens resulting from a review of teacher certification requirements in all 50 states. It is concluded that a given state's certification requirements are subject to varying interpretations, and that state certification is presently imprecise, nonstandardized, and confusing when viewed nationally. The following recommendations are reported: States should adopt a common language pertaining to certification; universal reciprocity should be endorsed by all states; all teachers of the mentally retarded should meet standard minimal certification requirements; minimal requirements should show competency in areas such as basic knowledge and teaching methods; teacher training institutions should be responsible for judging the teaching competence of graduates; and teacher training should be governed by standards for admission, advancement, retention, and due process.

Reynolds (1973) reported the results of a Delphi Survey, Rounds I and II. This Delphi Survey, undertaken as a part of the Council for Exceptional Children Project on Professional Standards and Guidelines, was intended to provide input to the project staff, feedback to the respondents, and information to all interested persons in the field on trends and issues in the field of special education. The query domains included the traditional professional topics—recruitment, selection, preparation, certification, accreditation, professional performance—plus several general areas of future predictions. Persons surveyed in both rounds included State Directors of special education and of teacher certification, college administrators, college faculty in speech and hearing and in special education, college students in the field of special education, regular school administrators and classroom teachers, special education administrators and teachers, speech and hearing therapists in local schools, and leaders in special education.

Reynolds (1974) discussed the simplification of certification with special educators in New York State.

"On a recent DELPHI survey involving about 1100 persons from many different areas of education from all parts of the nation, respondents indicated that they believed that the number of different kinds of special education certificates offered by state departments of education would decline over the next decade. A special 'leaders' group in special education, one of the subgroups on which analyses were made, indicated that by 1983 they expected the number in the field to be down from seven or eight different kinds of certificates to just three or four. College faculty members in special education, another subgroup, predicted that we would be down to about four certificates by 1983. These certificates would be, probably, in the areas of deaf education, education of the blind, and speech correction, plus a general certificate for other special education areas."

"Your own state report referred to the excessively 'narrow' preparation of special education teachers and recommended that 'a certificate for teacher of the handicapped should be issued for instructors prepared to teach a wide range of handicapped children' (Commission Report, 1972)."

"If, as appears likely, it should happen that individuals will be negotiating their special education 'certificates' on a more general basis with the state education department, it seems reasonable to assume that more detailed accounting will be called for elsewhere. Quite assuredly, the colleges as well as employing school districts face growing problems of assessing and documenting the specific competencies of educational personnel. These procedures will be expensive, difficult, and resisted. In the colleges, for example, it will be quite an undertaking to set up 'transcript' systems on the bases of well-tested competencies rather than of course titles and grades."

The Council for Exceptional Children, Professional Standards and Guidelines Project (1974) presented guidelines for recruitment/selection, preparation, certification, and professional performance of special educators. The guidelines are said to emphasize process rather than content of decision-making in an effort to encourage innovation, provide for flexibility, and develop continuing programs of professional development. Assumptions of the guidelines are said to include extension of the right to education to all children. It is explained that the guidelines were developed from results of regional conferences and a Delphi Survey. Presented for each guideline are the guideline statement, alternative statements, rationale for the guideline, and positive and negative examples of guideline applications. Guidelines in the area of recruitment/selection are concerned with selection from a broad base, effectiveness with children, mobility of individuals into new positions, criteria. The guidelines concerned with preparation are divided into the following categories: needs assessment, resource analysis, curriculum and methods, practicums, evaluation, and personnel. Guidelines for certification are presented in terms of criteria, renewal, range, evaluation, reciprocity, and experimentation. Suggested guidelines for professional performance deal with individual accountability, participation in evaluation, institutional support of inservice education, the right to perform within ethical standards, and grievance procedures. A glossary of 46 terms such as needs assessment and practicum is also provided.

A summary of the guidelines on certification is particularly pertinent to the purposes of this report:

3.1 Certification requirements should be sufficiently flexible to provide for the newly emerging and changing roles of special education personnel, and to encourage experimentation and innovation in their preparation.

3.1.1 Special education certification should be based upon demonstrated competencies in functions to be performed.

3.2 Certification in the field of special education should be for a limited period of time with periodic renewal based on relevent and continuous professional development.

3.3 Certification in special education should provide for those personnel who develop generic competencies to perform effectively with variously handicapped persons as well as those who develop highly specialized competencies to work with some exceptional persons.

3.4 Initial certification in special education should be based upon a program description and approval procedure; that is, individual preparation centers, upon approval from the appropriate state certification agency, should assume the responsibility for assessing and documenting the performances of program participants.

3.5 Procedures to facilitate reciprocity in the interstate transfer of special education credentials should be developed.

The full text of the section on certification is very relevant and extremely useful to this report.

Utilizing the descriptors, *teacher certification, credentials, certification* and *special education teachers,* an ERIC Search resulted in numerous citations, the most pertinent of which have been included in the review above. Other citations included information on learning disabilities certification, certification considerations in vocational education, mainstreaming, licensing of hearing clinicians and teachers of the hearing impaired, competence based training for special education teachers at the elementary level, a two-year program at the junior college level for teachers of the moderately to severely mentally retarded, an evaluative study of a graduate program (noncategorical approaches to the education of the handicapped), a study of special education teacher demand and supply for elementary and secondary schools in a state, a survey of certification requirements for teachers of children with learning disabilities, and a report of a conference on the preparation and certification of teachers of the deaf.

Of paramount importance, indeed universally pervasive throughout this report, is the landmark legislation, The Education of All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (Public Law 94-142). A veritable flood of powerful terms and concepts has inundated special and regular education teachers and administrators, and has cascaded into every area where children with handicapping conditions may be found:

Free appropriate public education
Special education and related services

Individualized education program
Procedural safeguards
Due process hearings
Parental involvement in process of identification, evaluation, placement, planning
Pre school programming
Specific learning disabilities
Comprehensive and nondiscriminatory assessment
Least restrictive environment
Confidentiality
State plan
Advisory panel

In tandem with Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1974 whose regulations become effective in 1977, P.L. 94-142 has assured the full force of law behind the civil and educational rights of our nation's handicapped citizens. Human rights and decency are and should be the foremost motivation in the minds of fairminded citizens to fully comply with the laws. However, the implications of non-compliance are compelling motivation to implement the law and regulations. Compliance is monitored from the federal agency through the state agency at the local educational agency level, and assures federal funding. Any state found in substantial non-compliance with P.L. 94-142 stands in jeopardy of losing all Federal funds to education. The U.S. Commissioner of Education is authorized to withhold all Federal funds to the state, including funds for Title I, Title IV-C, and the Vocational Education Act. Educational programs for all children could suffer.

Regulations for the implementation of P.L. 94-142 were proposed and published in the *Federal Register* of 12/30/76. After intensive nationwide discussion and amending of the proposed regulations, final regulations were published in the *Federal Register* of August 23, 1977. While all these regulations are of importance, the section particularly relevant to the issues attendant upon certification may be found in 121a380, Comprehensive System of Personnel Development. This section has been placed into Appendix A of this report.

With a second ERIC Search using the descriptors *educational certificates, teacher certificates, teacher certification, credentials, certification,* and *special education, handicapped children, exceptional child education, handicapped students, handicapped, exceptional students* and *special education teachers,* several additional citations were found related to the issues addressed in this report.

Blankenship (1972) edited the proceedings of a conference held by six midwestern states to discuss problems and concerns in reaching a reciprocity agreement for special education personnel. Each of the six states drafted a model for reciprocity of special education personnel and from these models a proposed model for an administrative agreement was organized. The document summarized the papers presented at the working Institute, the six states' agreements and recommendations.

Forgnone and Collings (1975) reported the results of a survey sent to state certification officers in each of the 50 states, requesting information on current and proposed certification requirements for special education administrators. Twenty-three states required no certification-endorsement in either general educational administration or special education. Eighteen states required that an individual who acts as a director of special education hold a general administration certificate. Three states required graduation from an approved program. The remaining six states had specific course and/or field experiences, and teaching experience requirements. A table specified particulars for those states having certification-endorsement for special education administrators. The authors concluded the need for special education administrators was imperative. They pointed out that twenty-three programs are producing special education administration leadership personnel; however, only nine states required certification requirements which demand some level of competency. They suggested minimal requirements for state certification endorsement to prepare professionals to maintain and develop programs for exceptional children.

Russo and Stack (1976) reported the results of a nationwide survey conducted to determine the current and future directions in state teacher certification in the area of educating the severely/profoundly handicapped.

1. Four states offered a categorical certification in the area of severely/profoundly handicapped.
2. Seven states anticipated having this certification by 1977.
3. Six states had no plans for developing a categorical certification, but did feel a need existed in their states.
4. Twenty-three states had no plans for developing such a certification and did not feel a need to do so.

States which offered teacher certification in the area of the severely/profoundly handicapped were asked to submit a copy of their requirements. The authors report five competency areas which were common among the four states presently offering certification for teachers of the severely/profoundly handicapped.

Russo and Stark suggested further investigation is necessary to identify trends in such realms as certification reciprocity agreements between the states, or the role training institutions will assume in delineating certification requirements in lieu of the particular state agency.

Hirshoren and Umansky (1977) reported a survey of preschool handicapped children certification guidelines. Certification for teachers of preschool handicapped children was offered in 12 states. An additional five states were currently in the process of developing certification guidelines in the area of preschool handicapped. A table incorporated teacher certification and known training programs in early childhood special education in the United States. The authors pointed to a discrepancy between the training and certification processes. The authors argued that early intervention considerations and the multiple responsibilities of the teacher, as well as needs generated by P.L. 94-142 to provide staff to serve young children with moderate to severe handicaps, all point to the need for a separate training area in early childhood special education.

The Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education distributed by the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (Sixth Edition, 1976) includes standards pertaining to programs for preparing teachers of exceptional children. Common standards applicable to all areas of special education are followed by standards for the respective areas. Programs leading to comprehensive certification for teachers of exceptional children shall meet the standards for each of the areas covered by the certificate. Specialized areas of concentration include programs in A. Emotionally Disturbed, B. Hearing Impaired, C. Mentally Retarded, D. Physically Handicapped, E. Visually Impaired, F. Learning Disabilities and G. Communicative Disorders.

At a December, 1977 meeting of the Interstate Certification Project, participants from states within each region of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification discussed issues impacting on the renewal of contracts in 1979. The meeting was intended to conceptualize issues and the pros and cons of those issues for presentation to the contract party states at the 1978 winter meeting of the Interstate Certification Project. Among many issues so discussed were issues attending the inclusion of special education teachers under the umbrella teacher contract.

METHOD

A copy of current requirements for professional certification in the area of special education (teaching, supervision and administration) was requested from each state. Where revision of such regulations was imminent, a draft copy of proposed revisions was also requested. The requesting letter was addressed to each state's director of teacher certification (or equivalent) as listed in the 1977 Director of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. One state indicated that current regulations were in process of revision and hence unavailable. To date, only two other states have not replied to the request; information for this report regarding their requirements was obtained from Abeson and Fleury (1972). The completed file of certification regulations constituted the data for this study.

The file of state requirements was systematically examined four times with differing objectives: (1) to obtain an overview and general familiarity; (2) to ascertain how each handicapped area was categorized and certified; (3) to ascertain the levels (or classes) of certificates in each state; and (4) to survey the extent and nature of certification of special education administrators/directors/supervisors/coordinators.

FINDINGS

The examination of each state's current certification regulations found a wide range of differences. The most evident and most basic difference among states was the number and type of distinct categories of special

education certification or endorsement. Using number of categories as the primary dimension, four general models of special education certification could be distinguished among the states. A discussion of these models, as well as a presentation of other findings, is presented below.

In the classification scheme adopted here, a category of certification is considered distinct if a separate endorsement to a basic certificate is required. To simplify the presentation of the models, no distinction is made between minor differences in terminology or between various levels or standards of certification.

A compendium of the data from which these findings are derived is presented in Appendices B and C. The table in Appendix B lists the categories of handicapping conditions for which each state offers separate certification or endorsement. The table in Appendix C lists the various types (or classes) of certificates available in each state as well as outlines the training requirements, number of years valid, renewability and grade levels. In the available certification documents from many of the states, much of this information was not clearly or explicitly specified. Where data could be inferred with little risk of error, they were included in the tables.

Certification Models

Model 1—Six or more categories of handicapping conditions.

A substantial majority of the states certify or endorse special educators in more than six categories of handicapping conditions. Reference to Appendix B will show that most states are typified by Model 1, with seven categories as the modal value.

Those states which have listed competencies as part of their certification requirements (e.g. Colorado, Nebraska, West Virginia) are subsumed under Model 1 for purposes of this survey. Other states which have adopted a competence-based model have based the approval of teacher preparation programs on expected competencies, thus obviating the need to delineate competencies in the regulations for teacher certification.

Model 2—Generic certificate with fewer than six categories of handicapping conditions.

Model 2 applies to those states which offer a single generic certificate for teacher of special education which encompasses several categories. In addition, several additional categorical certificates may be offered, usually in the areas of hearing impaired, vision impaired and/or speech-hearing impaired.

The following states have adopted this model:

Maryland:	Generic certificate and Audiologist and Deaf & Hearing Impaired categories
Montana:	Generic certificate and Speech Pathology category
New Jersey:	Generic certificate and Deaf & Hard of Hearing and Blind & Partially Sighted categories
New York:	Generic certificate and Deaf & Hearing Impaired, Speech & Hearing and Blind & Partially Sighted categories

Oklahoma:	Generic certificate and Deaf & Hard of Hearing, Emotionally Disturbed, and Learning Disabled categories
Oregon:	Generic certificate and Deaf & Hard of Hearing, Speech Handicapped, Blind & Visually Impaired and Severe categories
Pennsylvania:	Mentally and/or Physically Handicapped and Hearing Impaired, Visually Handicapped and Speech Correction categories
South Dakota:	Generic certificate and Speech & Hearing Clinician category
Vermont:	Generic certificate and Speech Therapy category

Hawaii and New Mexico offer a generic certificate as well as a variety of categorical certificates in special education.

Model 3—California

California uniquely endorses the specialist instructor in four categories as follows:

(a) learning handicapped: includes educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed and learning disabled.
(b) communications handicapped: includes deaf and hard of hearing, speech and hearing impaired and aphasia.
(c) physically handicapped: includes orthopedically handicapped, blind and visually impaired.
(d) severely handicapped: includes trainable mentally retarded and multiply handicapped.

Model 4—Massachusetts

Massachusetts uniquely classifies its special education certification in five categories:

(a) sensory handicapped (audition)
(b) sensory handicapped (visual)
(c) mildly handicapped
(d) moderately handicapped
(e) severely handicapped

Other Findings

A number of other findings from the state-by-state surveys are germane to this report.

(a) Variety of Terminology. A prolix profusion of particular terms pervades the field of special education. This became evident during the surveys across the states both with regard to the naming of the categories of handicapping conditions and with regard to the specification of course requirements. Both Abeson and Fleury (1972) and the National Association for Retarded Citizens report in "Teacher Preparation and Certification" (1973) found similar nonstandardization nationwide. Such variations in terminology frequently seem to represent only fine distinctions of semantics and are tractable in the context of this report. As federal "standard"

rubrics permeate the field, non-substantive distinctions may be eventually eliminated.

(b) Degrees of Specificity. States vary considerably with regard to the specificity of certification requirements, especially with respect to course-work. Some states simply state that "appropriate courses" or "approved program" are required. Other states specify and list the required courses by title and/or content. Several states have developed extensive lists of competencies required for certification.

(c) Approaches to Special Education Certification. Some states consider certification in special education as an endorsement to a basic or standard teaching certificate. Other states take the approach of a free-standing certificate. In certain cases, it is not possible to make clear distinctions and in other instances a mixed or dual approach is taken. Therefore, an exact count is not given here.

(d) Grade Levels. Many states make no explicit reference to grade levels for which special education certificates are valid. In such cases, it is assumed that the validity spans grades K-12. Some states have separate elementary and secondary special education certificates. A few states, usually in conjunction with an add-on or endorsement approach, have established a variety of grade-level categories, including primary (K-3), intermediate (4-6), middle (6-9), upper secondary (9-12), as well as combinations thereof.

(e) Permanency-Renewal. A plethora of combinations is evident across states with regard to the length of time valid, and provisions for renewal of certificates. These factors must be considered in tandem. A few states explicitly offer lifetime certifications, some with only minimal requirements. However, most states have adopted certifications with a time-limited validity (largely in range of 4-10 years) and with additional requirements for each renewal.

(f) Gifted Category. Only a few states currently make provision for certification or endorsement of teachers of the gifted.

(g) Administrative Categories. Several states have certificates available for various special education administrative functions. The titles include: administrator, supervisor, director, coordinator and/or curriculum specialist.

ISSUES, QUESTIONS, AND DISCUSSION STARTERS

The issues, questions and discussion starters which follow were developed after due consideration of the reports and documents discussed earlier, and after surveying the special education requirements across the fifty states.

The purposes of this section are:

. . . to cite some of the issues and questions which were raised and considered by the authors in drafting the report, and

. . . to provide a stimulus for workshop discussion.

Some of the items listed are obviously of more weighty or immediate concern than others. Although some effort has been made to order and rank these items, they were not always amenable to the process. Those items presented variously without comment, or as assertions, or as questions do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the authors of this report. The authors also recognize that this section does not present an exhaustive list of all issues and questions which may need to be addressed under certification, registration or licensing. Further, the discussion starters could have been significantly increased by both positive and negative consideration. We judged finally that our "neutral" approach most closely approximates the zero-based thinking out of which creative professional efforts grow, and also allows for each group to individualize its efforts.

Many of the discussion starters were derived from the Council for Exceptional Children "Guidelines for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children (Professional Standards and Guidelines Project)." It would be difficult to overstate the importance and value of this CEC Project or the thoroughness and care taken in drafting the Guidelines. This rich source of concepts related to special education personnel was incorporated as appropriate in the following sections of this report. The authors recommend the full document as worthy of study. A citation from the CEC Guidelines seems most appropriate to set the tone for this discussion section:

> Members of a profession define themselves as such not only by the body of knowledge and skills that are essential to and distinguish their occupation but also, and perhaps more importantly, by the practice of the occupation in a manner which is generally recognized as professional, that is, in accord with the methods and standards of the profession. (p. 1)

The Rules and Regulations implementing Public Law 94-142 provide for a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development. Paragraph 121a.-380 defines the scope of the system and requires each state education agency to describe "procedures to insure that all personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act are qualified." Qualified means that "a person has met state educational agency approved or recognized certifica-

tion, licensing, registration, or other comparable requirements which apply to the area in which he or she is providing special education or related services."[1] Handicapped children means "those children evaluated as being mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired, deaf-blind, multihandicapped, or as having specific learning disabilities who because of those impairments need special education and related services."[2]

ISSUE: CATEGORIES OF CERTIFICATION

These stipulations lead to the first basic issue to be addressed: to determine how many separate special education certification categories there should be to insure that the purposes of the Act are carried out by qualified personnel. A series of questions is immediately generated:

1. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the mentally retarded?*
2. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the hard of hearing?*
3. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the deaf?*
4. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the speech impaired?*
5. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach visually handicapped?*
6. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the seriously emotionally disturbed?*
7. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the orthopedically impaired?*
8. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach other health impaired?*
9. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach deaf-blind?*
10. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the multihandicapped?*
11. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach those with specific learning disabilities?*
12. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach gifted children?*

Another series of questions derives from the several age (or grade) levels served:

13. *Should there be a separate early childhood certificate for special education?*
14. *Should there be a separate elementary certificate for special education?*

[1]Paragraph 121a.12
[2]Paragraph 121a.5

15. *Should there be a separate secondary certificate for special education?*

Another issue to be addressed is whether, within categories or across categories, levels of severity should provide additional certificate differentiation.

16. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the mildly handicapped?*
17. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the moderately handicapped?*
18. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the severely handicapped?*
19. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the profoundly handicapped?*

Another set of questions bears on the various classes of certificates as reflected in the related requirements of training, experience, renewability and permanence:

20. *What requirements should there be for a provisional (or initial) certificate in special education?*
21. *What requirements should there be for a standard certificate in special education?*
22. *What requirements should there be for a professional (or permanent) certificate in special education?*

Based upon the locale in which the instruction is given, questions might be raised such as the following:

23. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach in residential school programs?*
24. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach in hospital and/or other institutional programs?*
25. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach the homebound?*
26. *Should there be a separate certificate to teach in non-residential, non-public schools?*

As indicated by the findings outlined in Appendices B and C the various states have dealt with this array of issues in a variety of ways.

Discussion Starter

At one extreme, if questions 1 through 19 above are all answered "yes", then 144 separate special education teaching certificates are generated for *each* class of certification (provisional, standard, or professional). Over 400 types of certificates are thus conceivable!

There is some question as to whether effective delivery of services to the handicapped is more likely to be hampered rather than fostered by such a

proliferation. Merely because a handicapped category is defined by state or federal statute does not imply that a separate teaching certificate should exist. To repeat, the problem is to determine what certificates are necessary to insure that services are rendered by qualified personnel.

The CEC Professional Standards and Guidelines report points to some of the criticisms of certification and credentialing practices:

> . . . credentialing may have been overstressed generally in our society and often the processes of credentialing became the self-serving instruments of professional incumbents or training institutions. . . . The Delphi survey results obtained as part of the CEC Guidelines project . . . suggested that the trend over the next decade will be to reduce the number of different categories of certification (perhaps) to only four or five different kinds . . . (page 42).

As the Findings section of this report demonstrates, a number of states have five or fewer categories of special education certification (cf. Models 2 and 3). Generally, these states offer a single generic special education teaching certificate encompassing most categories of handicapping conditions, with the addition of several specific categorical certificates in those fields requiring highly specialized training. Such a system seems to offer parsimony, flexibility, ease of administration, and effective application of the least restrictive environment principle. This system also clearly places dual burdens of professional responsibility upon preparatory programs to delineate graduates' competencies and field experience and upon hiring agencies to select candidates with appropriate training to meet local needs. Such a generic approach does not imply that each teacher so certified is expected to have competencies in each category of handicap.

Additional considerations come from the CEC Professional Standards and Guidelines project:

> Certification requirements should be sufficiently flexible to provide for the newly emerging and changing roles of special education personnel, and to encourage experimentation and innovation to their preparation. (3.1)

> Certification in special education should provide for those personnel who develop generic competencies to perform effectively with variously handicapped persons as well as those who develop highly specialized competencies to work with some exceptional persons. (3.3)

Institutions of higher education play a crucial role in any system of certification, as reflected in the following CEC recommendations:

> Preparation programs should reflect and promote the kind of interprofessional cooperation that should occur in school programs. (2.1.4)

> Preparation programs in special education should provide a balance between special and general educational skills to develop in each practitioner both the unique competency to function in specified roles and the ability to contribute appropriately to the planning and implementation of a variety of programs for exceptional as well as other individuals. (2.1.5)

> Preparation centers for special education personnel should maximize the use of the general instructional resources of their institutions and concentrate on the instruction of specialized topics in special education. (2.3.2)

Generally, states which have adopted a generic certificate have, in addition, several separate certification categories:

(a) A certificate to teach the deaf and hard of hearing.

(b) A certificate to teach the blind and visually handicapped. The principal justification for classifying these categories separately from the generic category is the need, in each case, for training in specialized modes of communication. There is ample historical antecedent and virtual unanimity among the states in recognizing the need for these certificates within special education.

(c) A certificate to teach the speech impaired.

The primary justification for considering speech impaired as a separate category is the fact that training programs and professional identification appear to be relatively well-established in this field.

However, a survey across the states has shown the greatest variation of terminology and classification in this area of certification. Some states have a certificate for speech and hearing teacher-therapist. Other states variously have certifications for teachers of the speech/language impaired, communications disabled, speech and communications disordered or a certificate in the area of speech correction. Some state education departments issue certificates to speech and hearing clinicians, speech pathologists, or audiologists. The point being made is that it is frequently difficult to make the distinction between those professionals functioning primarily as diagnosticians and those whose role is largely instructional. In the interest of efficient delivery of specialized services, there is merit to making such a distinction. That is, audiologists and pathologists, trained in the medical model, should be licensed by the department of health, and teachers of the speech/language impaired should be certified by the department of education. This view does not deny that diagnosticians should function with the aim of therapy-instruction or that teachers should be capable of ongoing evaluation-diagnosis.

This discussion section has thus far focused on questions 1 to 12 above. With respect to questions 13 to 19, the basic premise to be considered is whether separate certification levels are warranted by virtue of specialized training. In other words, the issue is whether preparation or training programs are *of necessity* sufficiently distinct across the age ranges (or ranges of severity of handicap) to warrant separate certifications.

With regard to questions of requirements for certification (i.e. questions 20 to 22), the following CEC guidelines are germane to the discussion.

> Initial certification in special education should be based upon a program description and approval procedure; that is, individual preparation centers, upon approval from the appropriate state certification agency, should assume the responsibility for assessing and documenting the performances of program participants. (3.4)

Practicum experiences should be initiated early and should be varied, continuous, and integrated elements of preparation programs. (2.5.2)

A major consideration in the selection of practicum settings for special education personnel should be the quality of the supervision provided. (2.5.3)

ISSUE: SUPERVISOR/ADMINISTRATOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

Three related questions address the issue of supervision and administration of special education:

27. *Should there be a certificate for supervisor of special education?*
28. *Should there be a special education administrator certificate distinct from special education supervisor certificate?*
29. *Should there be a special education administrator certificate distinct from a regular administrator certificate?*

Discussion Starter

The need for a supervisory function is inherent in the goal of individualized educational programming for all children with handicapping conditions. Where the responsibilities of an administrator are not substantially supervisory in the programmatic or curricular areas, the functions could be performed by an appropriately certified regular administrator.

The CEC Guidelines also point to the need for quality supervision in practicum settings for both preservice and inservice training.

ISSUE: PARTICIPATION OF OTHER AGENCIES

Paragraph 121a.381 calls for the state education agency to insure the opportunity for all interested parties to "participate fully in the development, review, and annual updating of the comprehensive system of personnel development." Several questions are evoked:

30. *What formalized process will insure input from representative groups into the conceptualization and implementation of teacher training programs, at both the preservice and inservice levels?*
31. *What input is desirable and/or possible into the process of certification, registration, and licensing?*

The following recommendations from the CEC Professional Standards and Guidelines Report are applicable here:

The individuals responsible for programs should undertake the selection of special education personnel on the basis of critical factors, one of which is the advice of professionals, parents, and others who understand the needs of exceptional persons. (1.1.3)

The planning and implementation of special education preparation programs should include opportunities at all levels for input from all

constituent groups, including the consumer, affected by the planning. (2.1.3)

The development and operation of quality practicums for special education preparation are the collective obligation of all relevant agencies and individuals. (2.5.1)

Preparation programs for special education personnel should be evaluated systematically and continuously. Such evaluation should involve representatives of all constituencies affected by the preparation programs, including students in the program. (2.6.1)

ISSUE: INSERVICE TRAINING

Paragraph 121a.382, Inservice training, is the most extensive individual section in the Rules and Regulations. Inservice training is defined as "any training other than that received by an individual in a full-time program that leads to a degree." A few questions apropos of inservice training also have relevance to certification questions:

32. *Who should be the recipients of inservice training?*
33. *Do certified special educators need inservice training?*
34. *Do certified regular educators need inservice training?*
35. *Should inservice training for all teachers dealing with handicapped children be mandatory?*
36. *Should inservice training be voluntary?*
37. *What incentives should be used to motivate teachers of handicapped children (for example, released time, payment for participation, options for academic credit, salary step grade, certification renewal, other)?*
38. *What proportion of available financial resources should be channeled into inservice training?*

ISSUE: PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Paragraph 121a.383, the personnel development plan, allows a focus on preservice and inservice education needs. A needs assessment is called for to aid in identifying needed areas of training and assigning priorities to those areas, as well as to identify the target populations for personnel development. These considerations prompt a whole series of possible questions, some of which have attendant commentary.

39. *If changes are made in certification requirements, should all teachers currently in service be issued a statement of continued eligibility under the prior regulations?*

In an idealistic sense, justice and fair play should prevail in personnel policy-making; in a practical sense, political considerations of acceptability should be considered. To change regulations and requirements in mid-

career would be unfair and most likely politically unacceptable. Upgrading of skills can be accomplished by various incentives.

40. Should all certificates in special education be periodically renewed?

Reference to Appendix C will affirm that many states do not offer a permanent or lifetime teaching certificate.

A recent study reported in the *New York Times* (Fowler, 1977) examined the issue of managerial and professional obsolescence in business and industry. The time during which an acquired body of knowledge becomes outmoded or superceded by 50 percent or more is surprisingly short, especially in the technical professions. It was estimated that five years out of college, an engineer may be obsolete; five years for a medical internist; ten years or less for a psychologist.

This study has implications for educators as well. The field of special education is by no means static, fixed, or undeveloping. Quite the contrary, it is currently one of the most dynamic and dramatic areas within education. The current state of flux would not likely have been predicted a decade ago; continued development in education is a highly probable characteristic. For this reason, continued professional development should be built into certification requirements. Several CEC guidelines support this opinion:

> Certification in the field of special education should be for a limited period of time with periodic renewal based on relevant and continuous professional development. (3.2)
>
> Responsibility and accountability for the continuing professional development and performance of special education personnel rest mainly with the individual. Preparation and employment agencies should support, assist, and encourage ongoing professional development. Assuming that the opportunities for continuing professional development are present, the responsibility for using the opportunities rests with the individual. (4.1)
>
> Special education personnel have a professional responsibility to participate in the objective and systematic evaluation of themselves, colleagues, services, and programs for the purpose of continuous improvement of professional performance. (4.2)
>
> Agencies employing special education personnel should make provisions for and support relevant continuing education for all staff. (4.3)
>
> Recruitment and selection processes should be carefully and continuously evaluated and revised accordingly. (1.1.4)

The renewal period should be within the range of four to ten years and should be predicated on continuing professional development, including advanced coursework.

41. What reciprocity provisions should be made to facilitate interstate transfer of special education credentials?

Currently, some 35 states are party to the Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel, as indicated in Appendix C.[1] Support for such interstate agreements is to be found in the CEC Project Guideline 3.5.

> There is obvious advantage to special education personnel when their qualifications for employment extend beyond one state. But it is also essential that a broad case of credentials be established because of the necessary movement of personnel from one state to another. In extremely low-incidence areas there may be only one preparation center for a large, multistate region. In such a case it is important that those who undertake preparation be certified in several states.
>
> One of the potential dangers in interstate reciprocity arrangements is that a uniform and potentially rigid set of categories and qualifications for certifications might be engendered. Fortunately, there are creative leaders among state certification officers who are able to produce balanced orientation to flexibility and standards, but much work remains to be done. In the DELPHI survey respondents almost uniformly placed high value on further work in this area.

42. Certification regulations should be realistic in terms of the present and/or near future availability of preparatory programs.

Cooperative manpower planning, both intrastate and interstate, will also shed light on this issue. Guideline 2.3.1 from the CEC Report states:

> Preparation centers for special education personnel should conduct programs only in those domains in which they possess or develop adequate resources and demonstrate their effective use.

43. Training programs should be located in architecturally accessible places so that handicapped students may achieve appropriate certification.

Special educators should be leaders in implementing the provisions of Section 514 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1974.

44. Should there be congruence between federal/state definitions of handicap categories and certificate terminology?

In some states, lack of such congruence breeds some thirty different definitions, categories or classifications in a variety of taxonomies.

45. Should the types and kinds of preparatory programs and certificates issued be based on incidence figures of handicapping conditions?

Support for preparatory programs should reflect priorities chosen in the context of limited resources and unmet needs.

The following guidelines from the CEC Report are germane:

> Programs for the preparation of special education personnel should be based on systematic, continuing needs assessments. (2.2.1)

[1] Further information concerning the Interstate Certification Project can be obtained from Helen Hartle, Director, c/o New York State Education Department, 99 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York 12230.

Preparation centers for special education personnel in any given region or state should cooperate in assembling appropriate data on manpower needs, keeping in mind changes that are occurring in roles and administrative arrangements. (2.2.2)

46. *Should institutions of higher education have the responsibility for determining necessary competencies, for their level of specificity, for training methods and for constructing a portfolio of competencies possessed by graduates of their programs?*
47. *What roles in the above process do state education agencies, local education agencies and other interested groups have to play?*
48. *Should the emphasis in special education certification be based on an integrated teacher preparatory program rather on an individual course-by-course basis?*

Guideline 3.4 from the CEC Report pertains to questions 46, 47, and 48.

Probably the most common approach to certification of individuals in education at this time is through an 'approved program' procedure, that is, when a preparation center is officially accredited for conducting a specific preparation program, individuals who satisfactorily complete the program are automatically certified by the state agency. In a sense, certification of individuals is subsumed under an institutional accreditation system.

This guideline urges the continuation of such a system for all classes of special education personnel. It is important to note, however, that this recommendation assumes that accreditation processes will be implemented with thoroughness. Furthermore, the implementation of the full set of guidelines in this document is implicitly a responsibility of preparation centers. For example, it is assumed that the 'approved program' will be operated on the basis of careful needs and resource analyses and result in well documented competencies of each individual trainee.

49. *Should a certificate as a special education teacher be sufficient credential for employment as a resource teacher?*
50. *Should there be a certificate in the area of adaptive physical education?*
51. *Should there be a separate certificate for special education work-study teachers?*
52. *Should there be a certification requirement for regular educators to teach children with handicapping conditions?*

A response to this question is exemplified by these requirements recently approved by the Texas State Board of Education.

"To be certified to teach on the elementary level or secondary level, a person shall have knowledge and skills relating to the education of exceptional/handicapped pupils, incorporated with the framework

of existing programs for elementary and secondary teachers, including:

- knowledge of the concept of least restrictive alternatives and its implications for the instructional process;
- knowledge of the characteristics and learning differences of exceptional/handicapped pupils;
- skills in informal assessment and a variety of instructional techniques and procedures for implementing the educational plan for exceptional/handicapped pupils; and
- knowledge of the admission, review, and dismissal processes and understanding of the individualized educational program for exceptional/handicapped pupils."

As another example, Oklahoma now requires a course in psychology of the exceptional child for all new standard teaching certificates.

53. *Should there be a preservice requirement of courses in the education of handicapped children in all teacher training programs?*
54. *How many credit hours of specified course work, if any, should be a preservice requirement for regular education certification?*
55. *What preservice requirements should there be for other supportive personnel (e.g., music, art, remedial reading, industrial arts)?*
56. *What preservice requirements should there be for regular education administrators and supervisors in the area of handicapping conditions?*
57. *What preservice requirement in the area of handicapping conditions should there be for school psychologists?*
58. *Should there be a preservice requirement in the education of children with handicapping conditions for physical education teachers?*
59. *Should there be preservice requirements in the area of handicapping conditions for professional personnel providing therapeutic and related services to children?*
60. *What preservice work should be recommended for medical personnel who will deal with handicapped children in school situations?*
61. *Should there be preservice requirements in the education of children with handicapping conditions for school social workers?*
62. *Should there be preservice requirements in the area of handicapping conditions for vocational education teachers?*
63. *Should there be preservice requirements in the area of handicapping conditions for guidance counselors?*
64. *Is the professional license of a speech pathologist all that should be required for school services to handicapped children?*
65. *Is the professional license for an audiologist all that should be required for school services to handicapped children?*

66. *Is the professional license of a physical therapist all that should be required for school services to handicapped children?*
67. *Is the professional license of an occupational therapist all that should be required for school services to handicapped children?*
68. *Should there be state licensing/approval for teacher assistants and/or teacher aides?*
69. *What requirements should be established for interpreters for deaf students?*

REFERENCES

Abeson, Alan & Fleury, J. S. (Eds.) *State Certification Requirements for Education of the Handicapped*, Arlington, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1972. (ERIC ED 069 063).

Blankenship, M. Elise & Pritchett, E. Milo, *Reciprocity: Certification of Special Education Personnel*. Proceedings of the Institute for Higher Education and State Departments of Special Education Personnel. DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University, 1972. (ERIC ED 070 746).

Blumberg, A., et. al. *Special Education Program Analysis: Term 1*, West Virginia College of Graduate Studies, Institute, 1974. (ERIC ED 104 102).

Creamer, J. J. & Gilmore, J. T. *Design for Competence Based Education in Special Education*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, 1974.

Directory of Learning Disabilities Services for State Education Agencies, National Association of State Directors of Special Education, 1976. (ERIC ED 130 487).

Durkee, F. M. *Special Education Teacher Demand and Supply for Elementary and Secondary Schools in Pennsylvania*, Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, Harrisburg Bureau of Information Systems, 1974. (ERIC ED 102 766).

Forgnone, Charles & Collings, Gary D. "State Certification-Endorsement in Special Education Administration" *Journal of Special Education*. Spring 1975 (ERIC EJ 136 128).

Fowler, E. M. "The obsolescence of professionals", *New York Times*, June 24, 1977.

Guidelines for Personnel in the Education of Exceptional Children: Professional Standards and Guidelines Project, Reston, Virginia: Council for Exceptional Children, 1974. (ERIC abstract ED 091 906).

Hirshoren, Alfred & Umansky, Warren, "Certification for Teachers of Preschool Handicapped Children" *Exceptional Children*. November 1977.

Hobbs, N. (Ed.) *Issues in the Classification of Children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Holmes, M. and Omvig, C. *Supplement "A" to Vocational Education for the Handicapped in Kentucky: A Survey of the Perceptions of Personnel in Vocational Education, Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation*. Final Report. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky, 1975. (ERIC ED 130 063).

Hunsaker, D. et. al. *Eastern Washington Special Education Consortium Training and Certification Program for Special Education Teachers at the Elementary Level*, Eastern Washington Special Education Consortium, Cheny, Washington, 1975. (ERIC ED 117 873).

Kern, William H. & Mayer, John B. "Certification of Directors of Special Education Programs: The Results of a National Survey" *Contemporary Education,* January 1971. (ERIC EJ 032 627).

Mainstreaming: Helping Teachers Meet the Challenge, Washington, D.C., National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, 1976. (ERIC ED 127 271).

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification: 1977 Directory. (n.d.)

Reynolds, M. C. *Delphi Survey: A Report of Rounds I and II.* Arlington, Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, September, 1973. (ERIC ED 087 734).

Reynolds, M. C. "Models for coalitions in special education teacher training: in J. J. Creamer & J. T. Gilmore *Design for Competence Based Education in Special Education.* Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, 1974.

Russo, Tony & Stark, Nancy B. "Teacher Certification Trends" Mental Retardation. October 1976. (ERIC EJ 151 516).

Teacher Preparation and Certification. Position statement and recommendations, Arlington, Texas: National Association for Retarded Citizens, 1973, (ERIC ED 091 890).

Woellner, E. H. *Requirements for Certification.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

APPENDIX A

FEDERAL REGISTER
VOL. 42, NO. 163
Tuesday, August 23, 1977

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

Education of Handicapped Children

Implementation of Part B of the
Education of the Handicapped Act

Rules and Regulations

Subpart B State Annual Program Plans

RULES AND REGULATIONS

COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

§ 121a.380 Scope of system.

Each annual program plan must include a description of programs and procedures for the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of personnel development which includes:

(a) The inservice training of general and special educational instructional, related services, and support personnel;

(b) Procedures to insure that all personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act are qualified (as defined in § 121a.12 of Subpart A) and that activities sufficient to carry out this personnel development plan are scheduled; and

(c) Effective procedures for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators of programs for handicaped children significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials developed through those projects.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.381 Participation of other agencies and institutions.

(a) The State educational agency must insure that all public and private institutions of higher education, and other agencies and organizations (including representatives of handicapped, parent, and other advocacy organizations) in the State which have an interest in the preparation of personnel for the education of handicapped children, have an opportunity to participate fully in the development, review, and annual updating of the comprehensive system of personnel development.

(b) The annual program plan must describe the nature and extent of participation under paragraph (a) of this section and must describe responsibilities of the State educational agency, local educational agencies, public and private institutions of higher education, and other agencies:

(1) With respect to the comprehensive system as a whole, and

(2) With respect to the personnel development plan under § 121a.383.

(20 U.S.C. 1412(7)(A); 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.382 Inservice training.

(a) As used in this section, "inservice training" means any training other than that received by an individual in a full-time program which leads to a degree.

(b) Each annual program plan must provide that the State educational agency:

(1) Conducts an annual needs assessment to determine if a sufficient number of qualified personnel are available in the State; and

(2) Initiates inservice personnel development programs based on the assessed needs of State-wide significance related to the implementation of the Act.

(c) Each annual program plan must include the results of the needs assessment under paragraph (b)(1) of this section, broken out by need for new personnel and need for retrained personnel.

(d) The State educational agency may enter into contracts with institutions of higher education, local educational agencies or other agencies, institutions, or organizations (which may include parent, handicapped, or other advocacy organizations), to carry out:

(1) Experimental or innovative personnel development programs;

(2) Development or modification of instructional materials; and

(3) Dissemination of significant information derived from educational research and demonstration projects.

(e) Each annual program plan must provide that the State educational agency insures that ongoing inservice training programs are available to all personnel who are engaged in the education of handicapped children, and that these programs include:

(1) The use of incentives which insure participation by teachers (such as released time, payment for participation, options for academic credit, salary step credit, certification renewal, or updating professional skills);

(2) The involvement of local staff; and

(3) The use of innovative practices which have been found to be effective.

(f) Each annual program plan must:

(1) Describe the process used in determining the inservice training needs of personnel engaged in the education of handicapped children;

(2) Identify the areas in which training is needed (such as individualized education programs, non-discriminatory testing, least restrictive environment, procedural safeguards, and surrogate parents);

(3) Specify the groups requiring training (such as special teachers, regular teachers, administrators, psychologists, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, physical education teachers, therapeutic recreation specialists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, [illegible]al personnel, parents, volunteers, hearing officers, and surrogate parents);

(4) Describe the content and nature of training for each area under paragraph (f)(2) of this section;

(5) Describe how the training will be provided in terms of (i) geographical scope (such as Statewide, regional, or local), and (ii) staff training source (such as college and university staffs, State and local educational agency personnel, and non-agency personnel);

(6) Specify: (i) The funding sources to be used, and

(ii) The time frame for providing it; and

(7) Specify procedures for effective evaluation of the extent to which program objectives are met.

(20 U.S.C. 1413(a)(3).)

§ 121a.383 Personnel development plan.

Each annual program plan must: (a) Include a personnel development plan which provides a structure for personnel planning and focuses on preservice and inservice education needs;

(b) Describe the results of the needs assessment under § 121a.382(b)(1) with respect to identifying needed areas of training, and assigning priorities to those areas; and

(c) Identify the target populations for personnel development, including general education and special education instructional and administrative personnel, support personnel, and other personnel (such as paraprofessionals, parents, surrogate parents, and volunteers).

§ 121a.384 Dissemination.

(a) Each annual program plan must include a description of the State's procedures for acquiring, reviewing, and disseminating to general and special educational instructional and support personnel, administrators of programs for handicapped children, and other interested agencies and organizations (including parent, handicapped, and other advocacy organizations) significant information and promising practices derived from educational research, demonstration, and other projects.

(b) Dissemination includes:

(1) Making those personnel, administrators, agencies, and organizations aware of the information and practices;

(2) Training designed to enable the establishment of innovative programs and practices targeted on identified local needs; and

(3) Use of instructional materials and other media for personnel development and instructional programming.

§ 121a.385 Adoption of educational practices.

(a) Each annual program plan must provide for a statewide system designed to adopt, where appropriate, promising educational practices and materials proven effective through research and demonstration.

(b) Each annual program plan must provide for thorough reassessment of educational practices used in the State.

(c) Each annual program plan must provide for the identification of State, local, and regional resources (human and material) which will assist in meeting the State's personnel preparation needs.

§ 121a.386 Evaluation.

Each annual program plan must include:

(a) Procedures for evaluating the overall effectiveness of:

(1) The comprehensive system of personnel development in meeting the needs for personnel, and

(2) The procedures for administration of the system; and

(b) A description of the monitoring activities that will be undertaken to assure the implementation of the comprehensive system of personnel development.

§ 121a.387 Technical assistance to local educational agencies.

Each annual program plan must include a description of technical assistance that the State educational agency gives to local educational agencies in their implementation of the State's comprehensive system of personnel development.

APPENDIX B

TABLE OF
STATE CERTIFICATIONS
BY
CATEGORY OF HANDICAPPING CONDITION

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition

State (Year of Regulations)	Deaf	Hard of Hearing	EMR	TMR	Speech-Hearing	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Alabama (1975)	Hearing Impaired		Mentally Retarded		Speech Correction	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disburbed	Learning Disabled
Alaska (1976)								
Arizona (1976)		Hard of Hearing	Mentally Handicapped		Speech-Language Therapy	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Handicapped	Learning Disabled
Arkansas (1976)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Mentally Retarded		Speech Therapy	Physically Handicapped		Specific Learning Disabled
California (1973)	Communication Handicapped		Learning Handicapped	Severely Handicapped	Communication Handicapped	Physically Handicapped	Learning Handicapped	Learning Handicapped
Colorado (1976)			Educational Handicapped			Physically Handicapped	Educational Handicapped	
Connecticut (1976)	Deaf		Mentally Handicapped		Speech & Hearing Specialist	Physically Handicapped	Social/Emotional Maladjusted	Learning Disabled
Delaware (1974)	Deaf & Hearing Impaired		Mentally Retarded			Physically Handicapped	Social/Emotional Maladjusted	Learning Disabled
Florida (1974)		Hearing Disabled	Mentally Retarded		Speech Correction	Motor Disabled	Emotionally Disturbed	Specific Learning Disability

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Blind	Visually Impaired	Multiple	Other Categories	Administration	Comments
Alabama (1975)		Visually Impaired	Multiple			
Alaska (1976)						No Categories Listed
Arizona (1976)		Visually Handicapped				
Arkansas (1976)		Visually Impaired				
California (1973)	Physically Handicapped		Severely Handicapped	Gifted		
Colorado (1976)		Visually Handicapped			Director of Special Ed.	
Connecticut (1976)	Blind	Partially Sighted		Neurologically Impaired		
Delaware (1974)	Blind & Visually Impaired				Principal of School for Exceptional Children	
Florida (1974)		Visual Disability		Varying Eception-ality		

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Deaf	Hard of Hearing	EMR	TMR	Speech-Hearing	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Georgia (n.d.)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Mentally Retarded			Physically Handicapped		Learning Disability
Hawaii (1971, 1978)	Hearing Impaired		Mentally Retarded			Orthoped-ically Handicapped	Seriously Emotionally Disturbed	Specific Learning Disability
Idaho (1976)	Auditory Impaired		Mentally Retarded				Emotionally Disturbed/ Social Maladjusted	Perceptually Impaired
Illinois (1976)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Educable Mentally Handicapped	Trainable Mentally Handicapped	Speech/ Language Impaired	Physically Handicapped	Social/ Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Indiana (n.d.)	Deaf		Mentally Retarded			Orthoped-ically Impaired	Emotionally Disturbed	Neurogical Impaired/ Learning Disabled
Iowa (1977)	Hearing Impaired		Mentally Disabled		Communication Disabled	Physically Disabled	Emotional Disabled	Learning Disabled
Kansas (1975-76)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Educable Mentally Retarded	Trainable Mentally Retarded	Speech & Hearing Audiology	Crippled & Cerebral Palsy	Personal/ Social Adjustment	Learning Disabled
Kentucky (1977)	Hearing Impaired			Trainable Mentally Handicapped	Speech & Communication Disorder	Learning & Behavioral Disorders		

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Blind	Visually Impaired	Multiple	Other Categories	Administration	Comments
Georgia (n.d.)						
Hawaii (1971, 1978)		Visually Impaired	Severely Multiply Handicapped	Deaf-Blind		Also generic special education certificate
Idaho (1976)		Visually Impaired	Multiple Handicapped		Director Supervisor	Pupil Personnel Certificate may be endorsed for speech & hearing therapist
Illinois (1976)	Blind & Partially Seeing					
Indiana (n.d.)	Blind	Partially Sighted				
Iowa (1977)		Visually Impaired	Multiple Handicapped	Chronically Disruptive Severely-Profoundly Handicapped Pre-School Handicapped	Supervisor	also Hearing Clinician & Speech Clinician Certificate
Kansas (1975-76)	Blind	Partially Sighted		Homebound/ Hospitalized Gifted	Supervisor	
Kentucky (1977)		Visually Impaired	Multiple Handicapped		Director, Teacher Consultant	

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Deaf	Hard of Hearing	EMR	TMR	Speech-Hearing	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Louisiana (1976)	Deaf & Hearing Impaired		Mentally Retarded		Speech, Language, Hearing	Crippled & Other	Socially Maladjusted/ Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Maine (1963)				Trainable Mentally Retarded	Speech, Hearing Clinician		Emotional Handicapped	Learning Disabled
Maryland (1975)	Deaf & Hearing Impaired				Audiologist			
Massachusetts (n.d.)	Sensory Handicapped (Audition)				Speech and Hearing Handicapped			
Michigan (1977)	Hearing Impaired		Mentally Impaired*		Speech/Language Impaired	Physically Impaired	Emotionally* Impaired	Learning* Disabled
Minnesota (1976)	Hearing Impaired		Educable Mentally Retarded	Trainable Mentally Retarded	Speech Correction	Crippled	Emotionally Disturbed & Social Maladjusted	Learning Disabled
Mississippi (1975)	Hard of Hearing		Mentally Retarded		Speech Correction	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Missouri (1974-5)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Educable Mentally Retarded	Trainable Mentally Retarded	Speech & Language Clinician	Orthoped-ically Handicapped	Behavioral Disorder/ Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Montana (1977)					Speech Pathology			
Nebraska (1977)	Hearing Impaired		Mentally Handicapped		Speech & Language Clinician	Orthoped-ically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Blind	Visually Impaired	Multiple	Other Categories	Administration	Comments
Louisiana (1976)	Blind & Partially Sighted				Supervisor/ Director	
Maine (1963)				General Special Education		
Maryland (1975)						All Others One Category
Massachusetts (n.d.)	Sensory Handicapped (Visual)			Mild Moderate Severe	Administrator	
Michigan (1977)		Visually Impaired		Homebound/ Hospitalized	Director, Supervisor	*Special Requirements
Minnesota (1976)		Visually Handicapped				
Mississippi (1975)		Visually Handicapped		Gifted		
Missouri (1974-5)	Blind & Partially Sighted			Severely Handicapped Early Childhood		
Montana (1977)						All Others One Category
Nebraska (1977)		Visually Handicapped			Curriculum Specialist (Director or Consultant)	

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Deaf	Hard of Hearing	EMR	TMR	Speech-Hearing	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Nevada (1974)	Aurally Handicapped		Mentally Handicapped		Speech Handicapped	Physically Handicapped	Educationally Handicapped	
New Hampshire (1974)	Acoustically Handicapped		Mentally Retarded			Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
New Jersey (n.d.)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing							
New Mexico (1976)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Educable Mentally Retarded		Communication Impaired	Physically Handicapped	Behavior Disorder	Learning Disabled
New York (1976)	Deaf & Hearing Impaired				Speech & Hearing			
North Carolina (1977)	Deaf, Hard of Hearing & Speech Impaired		Mentally Retarded			Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
North Dakota (1976)	Deaf & Hearing Impaired		EMR	TMR	Speech Lang. Disordered		Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Ohio (1972)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Educable Mentally Retarded		Speech & Hearing Therapy	Orthopedic	Learning Disabled/ Behavior Disordered	
Oklahoma (1975)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Mentally Handicapped *		Speech Correction *	Physically Handicapped *	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Oregon (1977)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing				Speech Handicapped			
Pennsylvania (1975)	Hearing Impaired		Mentally and/or Physically Handicapped		Speech Correction	Mentally and/or Physically Handicapped		

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Blind	Visually Impaired	Multiple	Other Categories	Administration	Comments
Nevada (1974)		Visually Handicapped		Academically Talented		
New Hampshire (1974)		Visually Handicapped		General Spec. Education		
New Jersey (n.d.)	Blind & Partially Sighted					All Others One Category
New Mexico (1976)	Blind & Visually Impaired			Gifted		Initial general special educ. certificate available
New York (1976)	Blind & Partially Sighted					All Others One Category
North Carolina (1977)		Visually Handicapped		Gifted		
North Dakota (1976)	Blind & Visually Impaired		Multiple	Gifted	Director, Coordinator	
Ohio (1972)		Visually Handicapped			Director, Administrative Spec.	
Oklahoma (1975)		Visually Impaired*				*All in one generic Certificate
Oregon (1977)	Blind & Visually Impaired			Severe		All Others One Category
Pennsylvania (1975)		Visually Handicapped				

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Deaf	Hard of Hearing	EMR	TMR	Speech-Hearing	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Rhode Island (1975)	Deaf & hard of Hearing		Mentally Retarded		Speech-Hearing Therapy	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Handicapped	
South Carolina (1976)	Hearing Handicapped		Educable Mentally Handicap'd	Trainable Mentally Handicapped	Speech Correctionist	Orthoped-ically Handicapped	Emotionally Handicapped	Learning Disabled
South Dakota (1976)					Speech & Hearing Clinician			
Tennessee (n.d.)	Deaf		Mentally Retarded			Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Texas (1976)	Deaf & Hard of Hearing		Mentally Retarded		Speech & Hearing	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Utah (1977)	Deaf		Intellectually Handicapped		Communication Disordered 1/		Emotionally Handicapped	Learning Disabled
Vermont (1977)					Speech Therapy			
Virginia (1968,1974)	Hearing Disordered		Mentally Retarded		Speech Disorder	Crippling Conditions	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
Washington (1975)								

1/ Endorsement issued for either speech pathology or audiology or both.

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Blind	Visually Impaired	Multiple	Other Categories	Administration	Comments
Rhode Island (1975)	Blind & Partially Seeing					
South Carolina (1976)		Visually Handicapped				
South Dakota (1976)					Director	All Others One Category
Tennessee (n.d.)	Blind					
Texas (1976)		Deficient Vision		Homebound/ Hospitalized		
Utah (1977)		Visually Impaired				Special Competencies & Endorsements
Vermont (1977)					Resource Consultant	All One Category
Virginia (1968, 1974)					Supervisor	
Washington (1975)						No Categories

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Deaf	Hard of Hearing	EMR	TMR	Speech-Hearing	Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled
West Virginia (n.d.)		Hearing Impaired	Mentally Retarded			Physically Handicapped	Behavior Disorder/ Social Maladjusted	Learning Disabled
Wisconsin (1977)	Deaf		Mentally Retarded		Speech & Language Disabilities	Orthopedic Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Special Learning Disabled
Wyoming (1975)	Acoustically Handicapped		Educable Mentally Retarded	Trainable Mentally Retarded		Physically Handicapped	Emotionally Disturbed	Learning Disabled

State Certifications by Category of Handicapping Condition (Cont.)

State (Year of Regulations)	Blind	Visually Impaired	Multiple	Other Categories	Administration	Comments
West Virginia (n.d.)		Visually Impaired		Gifted		Competencies Listed
Wisconsin (1977)		Vision Impaired			Supervisor	
Wyoming (1975)		Visually Handicapped				

APPENDIX C

TABLE OF
STATE CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
BY
TYPE OF CERTIFICATE

State Certification Requirements by Type of Certificate

State	Type (Class) of Certification	Requirements				Years Valid	Renewal	Grade Level	Comments
		Degree	Experience	Spec. Educ.	Other				
Alabama** (n.d.)	Class B	B		3 hrs.		n.s.	n.s.	E,S	
	Class A	M		yes	intern-	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
	Class AA	M		yes	6th yr. study	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
Alaska** (1976)	Regular	B		yes	6 hrs. every 5 yrs.	5	6 hrs. in 5 years	K-12	Special Ed. endorsement; Special service certif. for speech therapist & others
Arizona (1976)	Provisional	B			tran-script evalua-tion	1	no	K-12	
	Basic	B		yes	"	6	yes	K-12	
	Standard	M or 30		yes		6	yes	K-12	
Arkansas (1976)	Provisional	B				n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	
	Standard	B		yes		6	exper-ience & 6 hrs.	K-12	Free-standing w/ endorsement in area; free-standing speech therapist
California** (1973)	Preliminary Specialist	B&24		(24 hrs.)	Basic Certif.	5	no	P-12	Competencies listed
	Clear Specialist	B&24		(24 hrs.)	Basic	5	yes	P-12	Also advanced specialization endorsement available
Colorado (1976)	Provisional	B				3	no	K-12	
	General	B		yes		5	yes	K-12	Endorsement for all categories
	Professional	M or higher	3 yrs.	yes	Recency of teach-ing	5	yes	K-12	
Connecticut** (1976)	Provisional	B		yes		1-4	yes	E,S	Endorsement for Spec. Ed.
	Standard	M	3 yrs.	yes		10	perm. w/M	E,S	Endorsement for Spec. Ed.

State Certification Requirements by Type of Certificate (Cont.)

State	Type (Class) of Certification	Requirements				Years Valid	Renewal	Grade Level	Comments
		Degree	Experience	Spec. Educ.	Other				
Delaware** (1974)	Standard	B		yes		n.s.	n.s.	K-12	Free-standing for exceptional children endorsed by area
	Limited/Standard	B		yes		3	no	K-12	Free-standing for exceptional children endorsed by area
Florida** (1974)	(One type for each area)	B		yes or	Maj. in Sp. Ed.	5	yes	K-12	Free-standing; some categories require regular certificate also
Georgia (n.d.)	Provisional	B		yes		3	no	n.s.	
	Professional	B &		yes		7	6 hrs.	n.s.	
Hawaii** (1971, 1978)	Basic	B		Major		n.s.	n.s.	K-12	Free-standing
	Professional	5 yr. Prog.		yes		yes	Reg. Certif.		Endorsement or regular certificate
Idaho** (1976)	Initial exceptional child	B		yes		3	Once w/ 6 hrs. & 1 yr. exp.	n.s.	Generalist endorsement for mild-moderate or specialized endorsement in each area
	Professional	M or 30&	2 yrs.	yes		5	6 hrs. & 1 yr. exp.	n.s.	General or specialist endorsement
Illinois (1976)	Provisional	B		32 hrs.		2	no	K-12	Free-standing
	Standard Special	B		32 hrs.		4	ea.yr.	K-12	Free-standing
Indiana**	(No information available)								
Iowa** (1977)	Professional	B		20-30 hrs.		10	yes	several	Generic special education certificate with many different categories, levels and endorsements
	Permanent Professional	M	4 yrs.			life			

State Certification Requirements by Type of Certificate (Cont.)

State	Type (Class) of Certification	Requirements				Years Valid	Renewal	Grade Level	Comments
		Degree	Experience	Spec. Educ.	Other				
Kansas (1975-76)	Three-year	B	1 yr.		extra credits	3	yes	Several	Endorsement or Regular
	Five-year	B	3 yrs.	yes	extra credits	5	8 hrs.& 3 yrs. exper.	Several	Endorsement or Regular
Kentucky ** (1977)	Provisional	B		yes		10	yes	K-12	Renewals require coursework and experience; can be extended for life.
	Standard	M		24-30 hrs.		10	yes	K-12	Free-standing
Louisiana (1976)	Standard-C	B				3	no	E,S	Special Ed. endorsement on standard certificate
	Standard-B	B	3 yrs.			life			
	Standard-A	M	5 yrs.			life			Requires special coursework
Maine ** (1963)	Provisional	B		yes	Reg. Certif.	5	6 hrs.	E,S	Free-standing but need to be eligible for regular certif.
	Professional	B & 30	4 yrs.	18 hrs.		10	w/ evidence of continuing growth	E,S	
Maryland ** (1975)	Standard Professional	B		18 hrs.	or maj. in Sp. Ed.	5	once w/ 6 hrs.	K-12	Free-standing; all Special Ed. in one category
	Advanced Professional	M		yes		10	yes	K-12	Free-standing
Massachusetts ** (n.d.)	Basic	B	yes	18-24 hrs.	Basic Certif.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	

State Certification Requirements by Type of Certificate (Cont.)

State	Type (Class) of Certification	Requirements: Degree	Experience	Spec. Educ.	Other	Years Valid	Renewal	Grade Level	Comments
Michigan** (1977)	Provisional	B				6	or 3yrs. w/credits	E,S	Only in some categories
	Continuing	B&18 hrs.	3 yrs.	24 hrs.	Practicum	indef.		E,S	Free-standing
	30-hour Continuing	M or 30	3 yrs.	yes		indef.		E,S	
Minnesota** (1976)	Original	B		yes		2	no	E,S	For those w/ incomplete requirements
	Provisional	B	1 yr.	yes		1-5	no	E,S	Full certification required upon expiration
	Continuing	B	1 yr.	yes	extra credits	5	w/ credits	E,S or K-12	Free-standing
Mississippi (1976)	Class A	B		y		5	6 hrs.	K-12	Special Ed. endorsement w/ additional endorsement in area
	Class AA	B		15-24 hrs.	Class A	10	6 hrs.	K-12	
	Class AAA	M	3 yrs.	30-45 hrs.	Class AA	10	6 hrs.	K-12	
	Class AAAA	Ph.D.			Class AAA	life		K-12	
Missouri (1974-75)	Two-year	B		yes		2	no	K-12	Free-standing
	Permanent	B		30 hrs.		life		K-12	Free-standing
Montana** (1977)	Provisional	B		yes		2	w/ credits	K-12	Single endorsement for all Special Education
	Standard	B	1 yr.	yes		5	w/credits & exper.	K-12	
	Professional	B	3 yrs.	yes		5	w/credits & exper.	K-12	

State Certification Requirements by Type of Certificate (Cont.)

State	Type (Class) of Certification	Requirements				Years Valid	Renewal	Grade Level	Comments
		Degree	Experience	Spec. Educ.	Other				
Nebraska** (1977)	Provisional	B				1-3	no	K-12	All have endorsement to basic certificate
	Pre-Standard	B			6hrs. in 3yrs.	5	yes w/ 6 hrs.	K-12	
	Standard	B	1 yr.		ditto	7	ditto	K-12	
	Professional	M or fifth yr.	1 yr.		ditto	10	ditto	K-12	
Nevada (1974)	(Regular)	B		yes		5	6 hrs.	n.s.	Endorsement
	Professional	M	3 yrs.	yes		6	6 hrs.	n.s.	Endorsement
New Hampshire** (1974)	Beginning Educator	n.s.	Competencies		Approved program	3	no	K-12	
	Experienced Educator	n.s.	Competencies		Approved program	6	Successful performance & recom.	K-12	
New Jersey** (n.d.)	Instructional	B		30 hrs.		perm.		K-12	Endorsement
New Mexico (1976)	General Special Education	B		24 hrs.	Cont'd enrollment	8	no	K-12	No category of specialization; must go to next level within 8 years
	Professional Categorical	M or 30 hrs.	3 yrs.	yes		n.s.	n.s.	K-12	
	Professional in Related Sp. Ed.	M or 30 hrs.	3 yrs.	yes		n.s.	n.s.	K-12	For special services
New York** (1976)	Provisional	B		2½ hrs.	Practicum or 1 year	5	no	K-12	Free-standing
	Permanent	M		yes		life		K-12	
North Carolina** (1977)	(Four levels, depending on degree)	n.s.			Program approval	S	yes	K-12	Extensive delineation of competencies for preparatory program

State Certification Requirements by Type of Certificate (Cont.)

State	Type (Class) of Certification	Requirements				Years Valid	Renewal	Grade Level	Comments
		Degree	Experience	Spec. Educ.	Other				
North Dakota (1976)	(Valid Regular certificate w/ Spec. Ed. credential for each category)	n.s.		yes	varying	Indeterminate, but limited	varying	K-12	Endorsement credential for Special Education
Ohio** (1972)	Provisional	B	yes	yes	Standard certificate	5	w/ satisfactory experience	K-12	Free-standing
	Professional	B	27 mo.	yes	Standard certificate	5	w/ satisfactory experience	K-12	Free-standing
	Permanent	M or 30 hrs.	45 mo.	yes		life		K-12	Free-standing
Oklahoma** (1975)	Temporary	B	2 yrs.	yes		1	no	K-12	Both free-standing or conversion; extensive course listings "permanent" requires renewal.
	Provisional	B	2 yrs.	yes	courses w/ in 5 yrs.	3	no	K-12	
	Standard (Permanent)	B	2 yrs.	yes	same	5	yes	K-12	
Oregon (1977)	Basic	B		yes		3	w/graduate study	E,S	Endorsement
	Standard	M or equivalent	2 yrs.	yes		5	w/ 1 yr. exper.	E,S	Endorsement
Pennsylvania** (1975)	Provisional	B				3	yes	P-12	
	Permanent	B&24 hrs.	3 yrs.			life		P-12	Program approval procedures
Rhode Island** (1975)	Provisional	B		24 hrs.		6	no	K-12	Free-standing
	Professional	M or 36 hrs.	2 yrs.	yes		life		K-12	Free-standing

State Certification Requirements by Type of Certificate (Cont.)

State	Type (Class) of Certification	Requirements				Years Valid	Renewal	Grade Level	Comments
		Degree	Experience	Spec. Educ.	Other				
South Carolina (1976) **	Class III	B			Nat'l. Teacher Exam	5	6 hrs.	K-12	Free-standing or endorsement
	Class II	B&18 grad.hrs.				5	6 hrs.	K-12	
	Class I	M&6grad. educ. hrs.				5	6 hrs.	K-12	
	Class I-Specialist	M&30				5	6 hrs.	K-12	
	Class I-Advanced	D w/ 12grad. educ. hrs.				5	6 hrs.	K-12	
South Dakota** (1976)	Basic (single certificate)	B		yes		5	6 hrs. & recommendation	E,S	Special Education all one endorsement to Basic
Tennessee	(Not available)								
Texas (1976)	Permanent Provisional for Teachers of Exceptional Children (sic)	B		yes		perm.		K-12	Free-standing w/ endorsement in each category
Utah** (1977)	Basic Professional	B		yes		5	w/ additional study	K-12	Endorsement
	Professional	M	3 yrs.	yes		5	ditto	K-12	Endorsement
Vermont** (1977)	Professional Probationary	B		yes		1	up to 4yrs.	E, S	Special Educational Services generic endorsement for all categories
	Professional Standard	B	2 yrs.	yes		5	6 hrs.	E,S	
	Professional Continuing	M or 30 hrs.	5 yrs.	yes		10	w/ prof. growth	E,S	
Virginia** (1968, 1974)	Collegiate Professional	B		yes		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	Erdorsement

State Certification Requirements by Type of Certificate (Cont.)

State	Type (Class) of Certification	Requirements				Years Valid	Renewal	Grade Level	Comments
		Degree	Experience	Spec. Educ.	Other				
Washington** (1975)	Provisional (or Initial)	B				3	Once w/ study	E,S	No Special Education endorsement
	Standard (or Continuing)	B			5th yr.. of study	Indef.		E,S	Valid while in service and for period thereafter
West Virginia** (n.d.)	Professional	n.s.		yes	Competencies	n.s.	n.s.	K-12	
Wisconsin** (1977)	General Professional	B		yes		3	n.s.	K-12	Speech & Hearing Clinician requires M. All free-standing.
Wyoming (1975)	Initial	B		15 hrs.		3	no	K-12	Endorsement
	Standard	B	3 yrs.	21 hrs.		5	5 hrs. study	K-12	Endorsement
	Professional	M	5 yrs.			10	10 hrs. study	K-12	Endorsement

LEGEND

** indicates legislation enacted as of June 1, 1977 relative to Interstate Agreement on Qualification of Educational Personnel of Interstate Teacher Certification Project.

n.s. not specified

E,S elementary, secondary

M Master's Degree

B Bachelor's Degree

n.d. not dated